

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JAYNA CARTER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

OTIS ELEVATOR CO., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:11-CV-00662-RCJ-WGC

**ORDER**

November 10, 2011

PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. JONES, UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: NONE APPEARING REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the Court is Defendant Circus Circus' Motion for Clarification and or Reconsideration (ECF No. 12) filed with the Court on November 8, 2011.

Plaintiff Jayna Carter has sued Otis Elevator Co. ("Otis") and MGM Resorts International, d.b.a. Circus Circus Hotel and Casino ("Circus Circus") in diversity for damages arising out of injuries she allegedly sustained while riding in one of Otis's elevators at Circus Circus's Reno, Nevada location. Otis filed a motion for demand of security of costs (ECF No. 5), and Plaintiff responded by posting a \$500 bond (ECF No.

1 6)<sup>1</sup>, the maximum amount a defendant may demand that a non-resident plaintiff post under  
2 state law. On October 20, 2011, Circus Circus filed a Demand for Security for Costs (ECF  
3 No. 7), and Plaintiff posted a \$500 bond (ECF No. 10)<sup>2</sup>.

4 On November 3, 2011 the Court entered a Minute Order (ECF No. 11) denying both  
5 Demand for Security for Costs (ECF No. 5) and Defendant Circus Circus' Demand for  
6 Security for Costs (ECF No. 7) as moot. Circus Circus argues that this Court should  
7 reconsider its order denying the demand for security as moot, or, alternatively, to reconsider  
8 and order Plaintiff to provide security in the amount of \$500 on behalf of Defendant Circus.

9 A thorough reading of the bonding instruments indicates that although the bonds are  
10 similar, the bond numbers and effective dates are different. Here, Plaintiff has satisfied  
11 Defendants' demands for security for costs.

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Reconsider (ECF No. 12) is DENIED.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated this 9th day of November, 2011.

15  
16   
17 ROBERT C. JONES  
18 Chief Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 <sup>1</sup>Bond No. LSM0329818, Effective Date October 4, 2011

28 <sup>2</sup>Bond No. LSM0352264, Effective Date October 31, 2011